



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,282	07/19/2001	Yasushi Yamade	011350-283	2056

7590 08/11/2006

Platon N. Mandros
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

CAO, DIEM K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/910,282

Applicant(s)

YAMADE, YASUSHI

Examiner

Diem K. Cao

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 11,13,19, 23, 31 and 32.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/12/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 3, 11, 19, 21-22 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canon (JP, 10-254708,A) in view of Harding (U.S. 5,794,052).**

As to claim 1, Canon teaches a step of automatically referring to regional information identifying a particular region (regional information setting unit 102 ... PC 100; page 2, lines 18-20, page 3, lines 9-19 and page 4, lines 17-23), that regional information being set in the

Art Unit: 2194

computer terminal in advance (The regional information ... part of the file name; page 2, lines 20-24), a selection step of automatically selecting one of multiple printer drivers store on the recording medium on the basis of the referred to regional information (page 3, lines 19-24 and page 5, lines 6-11 and page 11, lines 16-18), and a step of installing the selected printer driver on the computer terminal (page 5, lines 11-17).

Canon does not teach the multiple printer drivers corresponding to multiple different regions respectively. However, Harding teaches the multiple software modules corresponding to multiple different regions, respectively (the computer manufacture ... as an option; col. 6, lines 16-18 and col. 9, line 67 – col. 10, line 2 and col. 11, lines 55-57 and col. 12, lines 58-61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Canon and Harding because it provides a solution that provides the users with a quick, less confusing and more convenient of setting up software on the computer (col. 4, lines 4-8).

As to claim 3, Harding teaches the regional information set in the computer terminal in advance includes information concerning languages set in the computer terminal (col. 4, lines 4-8 and col. 6, lines 39-41).

As to claim 11, it is the same as the method claim of claim 1 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claim 19, it is the same as the method claim of claim 1 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claim 21, see rejection of claim 3 above.

As to claim 22, Canon teaches the plurality of printer drivers are stored on a computer-readable medium (page 2, lines 3-6).

As to claim 31, it is the same as the method claim of claim 1 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

5. Claims 2, 12, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canon (JP, 10-254708,A) in view of Harding (U.S. 5,794,052) further in view of Garney (U.S. 6,081,850).

As to claim 2, Canon does not teach the selection step comprising steps of referring to a table that correlates the regional information with addresses where each printer driver is stored, and selecting one of the printer drivers by specifying an address corresponding to the regional information. However, Garney teaches device drivers are stored on a mass storage device of a computer system (col. 6, lines 1-10), the mass storage device has a look up table which maps each type of the card to a memory area of the mass storage device, and the device driver to control the card is stored in the memory area (col. 4, lines 44-55), and selecting one of the driver

Art Unit: 2194

by specifying an address (point directly to the location on the mass storage device of the device driver; col. 9, lines 22-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Canon and Garney because it would improve the performance of Canon system by referring directly to the locations of the software that need to be installed.

As to claims 12 and 20, see rejection of claim 2 above.

6. Claims 4, 5, 10, 13-14, 23-24, 29-30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harding (U.S. 5,794,052) in view of Canon (JP, 10-254708,A).

As to claim 4, Harding teaches a step of referring regional information set in the computer terminal in advance (col. 6, lines 39-41 and col. 13, lines 5-10), a selection step of selecting a piece of set up information from multiple pieces of setup information stored on the recording medium on the basis of the referred regional information (batch file for selected language; col. 6, lines 41-51, col. 10, lines 49-54), the multiple pieces of setup information corresponding to multiple different regions, respectively (col. 1, lines 32-34 and col. 2, lines 51-54), a step of installing a control program and the selected piece of setup information on the computer terminal (col. 6, lines 51-54 and col. 10, lines 60-62).

Harding does not teach automatically referring to regional information identifying a particular region, and the selection step of automatically selecting a piece of set up information, and a method of installing a printer driver. Canon teaches automatically referring to regional

Art Unit: 2194

information identifying a particular region, and the selection step of automatically selecting a piece of software, and a method of installing a printer driver (regional information setting unit 102 ... PC 100; page 2, lines 18-20; page 3, lines 9-24; page 4, lines 17-23; page 5, lines 6-17; and page 11, lines 16-18.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Harding and Canon because it provides a method to install program automatically without user action.

As to claim 5, Harding as modified teaches the selection step is executed by using a setup selection module contained in the control program (col. 12, lines 21-25).

As to claim 10, Harding teaches the regional information set in the computer terminal in advance includes information concerning languages set in the computer terminal (col. 4, lines 4-8 and col. 6, lines 39-41).

As to claim 13, it is the same as the method claim of claim 4 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claim 14, see rejection of claim 5 above.

As to claim 23, it is the same as the method claim of claim 4 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claim 24, see rejection of claim 5 above.

As to claim 29, see rejection of claim 10 above.

As to claim 30, Harding teaches the plurality pieces of setup information are stored in a computer-readable medium (col. 11, lines 55-57).

As to claim 32, it is the same as the method claim of claim 4 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

7. Claims 6-8, 15-17, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harding (U.S. 5,794,052) in view of Canon (JP, 10-254708,A) further in view of Hanson (6,148,346).

As to claim 6, Harding does not teach the setup information includes language information used for displaying the status of printing conditions a screen. Hanson teaches the displayed GUI regarding the printer setup information, menu items selections and status information of the printer are provided from the printer driver (col. 5, lines 13-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Harding and Hanson because the component driver could be the function to display the printing condition on the screen.

As to claim 7, Harding does not teach the setup information includes information on printing paper sizes to be used on the printer. Hanson teaches the displayed paper size is provided from the printer driver (col. 5, lines 53-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Harding and Hanson because the component driver could be the function to display the paper size to be used.

As to claim 8, Harding does not teach the setup information includes information on measurement unit systems to be used for setting up printing conditions and displays. However, Hanson teaches the displayed GUI regarding the printer setup information, menu items selections and status information of the printer are provided from the printer driver (col. 5, lines 13-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Harding and Hanson because the component driver could be the function to specify the measurement unit systems to be used.

As to claims 15-17, see rejections of claims 6-8 above.

As to claims 25-27, see rejections of claims 6-8 above.

Art Unit: 2194

8. Claims 9, 18 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harding (U.S. 5,794,052) in view of Canon (JP, 10-254708,A) further in view of Garney (U.S. 6,081,850).

Harding does not teach the selection step including the steps of referring to a table that correlates the regional information with addresses where each piece of setup information is stored, and selecting a piece of setup information from multiple pieces of information by specifying an address corresponding to the regional information. However, Garney teaches device drivers are stored on a mass storage device of a computer system (col. 6, lines 1-10), the mass storage device has a look up table which maps each type of the card to a memory area of the mass storage device, and the device driver to control the card is stored in the memory area (col. 4, lines 44-55), and selecting one of the driver by specifying an address (point directly to the location on the mass storage device of the device driver; col. 9, lines 22-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Harding and Garney because it would improve the performance of Harding system by referring directly to the locations of the software that need to be installed.

As to claims 18 and 28, see rejection of claim 9 above.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Diem K. Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 5:30AM - 2:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DC
August 4, 2006


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100